GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
ABSTRACT

MA & UD Department - Results Framework Document (RFD) – Preparation of work plan for Commissioners, GHMC, VMC, GVMC and WMC – Connecting RFD to performance Appraisal - Orders – Issued.

MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION & URBAN DEVELOPMENT (R) DEPARTMENT

G.O.Rt.No.387   Dated: 07.03.2014
                                                   Read the following:-

1. D.O.Lr.No.323/GA(GPM&AR)/2012-13/2, Dated: 04.12.2012 from the Principal Secretary, GAD, A.P. Secretariat, Hyderabad
2. Government memo.No.28845/R/2012, Dated: 11.12.2012

* * *

ORDER:-

According to the performance review rules a work plan has to be prepared by each officer at the beginning of the Financial Year. Based on the Results Frame Work Document (RFD) prepared, Government have prepared a Work Plan which is annexed to the G.O., for Municipal Commissioners who will prepare their strategy and drill down: set numerical objectives for various activities in the Work Plan, disaggregate activities and prepare a Plan of Action (PoA) showing each sub-activity to be completed every fortnight, in the form a PERT Chart. The Plan of Action (PoA) will be used by the Government to monitor, fortnightly and assess the annual performance of Commissioners.

2.   Separately, an independent evaluation on the information will be done by the Government on the information given by the Municipal Commissioners.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

Dr. SAMEER SHARMA
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
& COMMISSIONER, UPA

To
The Commissioners, GHMC, GVMC, VMC, WMC.
The Special Commissioner/Additional Commissioner (P&P),
Zonal Commissioners   (Central) and(North), through GHMC,
The Commissioner/Additional Commissioner (Vizag) through Commissioner, GVMC, Visakhapatnam
Copy to:
PS to Chief Secretary to Government,
PS to Principal Secretary (UD), MA&UD
PS to Principal Secretary (MA), MA&UD
Sf/Sc

// FORWARDED :: BY ORDER //

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE

Work Plan for Municipal Commissioners (2014-15)

The objectives and performance norms

1. Clean cities and towns (25 marks),

2. To strengthen the financial position of the ULBs (15 marks),

3. To make Governance in ULBs Transparent and Accountable (20 marks),

4. To Facilitate Participatory and Consultative Development (10 marks),

5. To improve Capacities of ULB Functionaries and Stakeholders (10 marks),

6. To improve civic infrastructure (10 marks),

7. Inclusive Development (10 marks),

8. Other,

9. Other, and

10. Other.

Inter se Priorities among key objectives, success indicators and targets

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9	Column 10	Column 11
						Target / Criteria Value				
Objective	Weight	Actions	Success Indicator	Unit	Weight	Ex-cellent (80% and above)	Very Good (70-80%)	Good (60-70%)	Fair (50-60%)	Poor (Less than 50%)
Objective – 1 **Clean cities and towns**	25	**Action - 1 :** Collection of MSW at Source	Door-to-door collection of Solid Waste	% of house-holds covered	5	**100%**				
		Action - 2 : Segregation of Solid Waste at source	Extent of Segregation of solid waste at source	% of house-holds covered	2	**100%**				
		Action - 3 : Implementation of guidelines issued for MSW	Efficiency of transport of municipal solid waste	% of municipal solid waste collected	3	**100%**				
		Action 4: Implementation of Processing and Treatment	Extent of Processing & Treatment of MSW	% of MSW Processed and Treated	5	**100%**				
		Action 5: Prepare City Sanitation Strategy as given in GoMs 64	Preparation of CSS by 30/9/2014 and implementation thereafter	Date	10	**100%**				
Objective – 2	15	**Action 1:**	Collection of al	% of	5	**100%**				

3

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9	Column 10	Column 11
						Target / Criteria Value				
Objective	**Weight**	**Actions**	**Success Indicator**	**Unit**	**Weight**	**Ex-cellent (80% and above)**	**Very Good (70-80%)**	**Good (60-70%)**	**Fair (50-60%)**	**Poor (Less than 50%)**
To strengthen the financial position of the ULBs		Revenue Collection	Taxes and Non taxes	Collection (arrear + current as on April 01, 2014)						
		Action 2: Property Tax (PT) Assessments.	Coverage of Households to PT as compared to the number given in census	% of Coverage	5	**100%**				
		Action 3: Total collections per capita	Corporations (Rs. 1000; municipalities; municipalities Rs. 800; others Rs. 500)	% collected against norms given in indicator column for per capita	5	**100%**				
Objective – 3 **To make Governance in ULBs Transparent**	20	**Action 1:** Implementation of citizen charter as evaluated from mee seva data	Number disposed within time	% of disposal within time	5	**100%**				

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9	Column 10	Column 11
						Target / Criteria Value				
Objective	Weight	Actions	Success Indicator	Unit	Weight	Ex-cellent (80% and above)	Very Good (70-80%)	Good (60-70%)	Fair (50-60%)	Poor (Less than 50%)
and Accountable										
		Action 2: Implementation of mobile governance as given in GoMs 54	Number of activities made accountable vs. total to be made accountable	% of activities made accountable	5	-				
		Action 3: Implementing the SIRA program for mosquito control as given in GOMs.50	a. Number of wards in which SIRA implemented b. Number of outcome indicators showing reduction in all wards	a. Percentage of wards covered. b. Percentage of reduction in malaria, dengue (y-o-y). c. Percentage of wards having	10					

5

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9	Column 10	Column 11
						Target / Criteria Value				
Objective	Weight	Actions	Success Indicator	Unit	Weight	Ex-cellent (80% and above)	Very Good (70-80%)	Good (60-70%)	Fair (50-60%)	Poor (Less than 50%)
				mosquito density below norms						
Objective – 4 **To Facilitate Participatory and Consultative Development**	10	**Action 1:** Participation of Ward Committees and Area Sabhas as prescribed in GO NO. 1 in SWM	Number Covered a. Wards b. Areas	a. % of wards covered b. % of areas covered	2	**100%**				
		Action 2: Organization of the Poor -	a. Organization of Poor into Self Help Groups b. Number of street vendors given identity cards vs. total	a.% of Urban Poor House-holds, as compared to census information, covered b. % given identity	4	**100%**				

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9	Column 10	Column 11
						Target / Criteria Value				
Objective	Weight	Actions	Success Indicator	Unit	Weight	Ex-cellent (80% and above)	Very Good (70-80%)	Good (60-70%)	Fair (50-60%)	Poor (Less than 50%)
				cards						
		Action 3: Development of Parks and Play grounds according to GO Ms No. 68	No of Parks and Play grounds to be developed under Community Participation – half of the open spaces in city.	% of Parks/ Play-grounds developed out of target	2	-				
		Action 4: Maintenance of Community Toilets, Sports complexes, parks by ward committees with Community Participation as in GoMs 1	All to be maintained	% of community toilets, sports complexes and parks maintained	2	- -				
Objective 5	10	**Action 1:**	Number of	% of DOCs	2					

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9	Column 10	Column 11
						Target / Criteria Value				
Objective	Weight	Actions	Success Indicator	Unit	Weight	Ex-cellent (80% and above)	Very Good (70-80%)	Good (60-70%)	Fair (50-60%)	Poor (Less than 50%)
To improve Capacities of ULB Functionaries and Stakeholders		Preparation of DOCs for the ULB as given in GOMs 73	DOC s prepared vs. to be prepared	prepared						
		Action 2: Preparation of Training Needs Assessment for all functionaries	Number of functionaries assessed vs. total to be assessed	% whose needs assessed	3	-				
		Action 3: Training of ULB functionaries by NIUM	10% of Municipal functionaries to be trained by March 2015	% of Municipal Functionarie s Trained.	3	**100%**				
		Action 4: Training of Ward Committee members and area sabha representatives	100% to be trained by March 2015	% Trained.	2	-				
Objective – 6 To improve civic	10	**Action 1:** Making neighborhoods	At least ten in corporations and five in	% made compliant	2	-				

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9	Column 10	Column 11
						Target / Criteria Value				
Objective	Weight	Actions	Success Indicator	Unit	Weight	Ex-cellent (80% and above)	Very Good (70-80%)	Good (60-70%)	Fair (50-60%)	Poor (Less than 50%)
infrastructure		LEED –ND compliant	municipalities and one in nagar panchayats							
		Action 2: Implemen-tation of **UIG/UIDSSM T**	Utilization of Funds	% of funds utilized	2	**100%**				
		Action 3: Imple-mentation of BSUP/ IHSDP	Utilization of Funds	% of funds utilized	2	**98%**				
		Action 4: Provision of TIF as in GOMs 79	At least one project to be implemented	% of funds utilized	2	**100%**				
		Action 5: Provision of Urban In-frastructure with state grants.	Utilization of Funds	% of funds utilized	2	**100%**				
Objective – 7 **Inclusive**	10	**Action 1:** Earmarking of funds for	Utilization of funds earmarked in	% of earmarked funds	4	**100%**				

9

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9	Column 10	Column 11
						Target / Criteria Value				
Objective	Weight	Actions	Success Indicator	Unit	Weight	Ex-cellent (80% and above)	Very Good (70-80%)	Good (60-70%)	Fair (50-60%)	Poor (Less than 50%)
Development		Urban Slums	the Budget	utilized						
		Action 2: Earmarking of Funds for development of SC/ST areas.	Utilization of funds earmarked in the Budget	% of earmarked funds utilized	4	**100%**				
		Action 3: a. Earmarking of Funds for welfare of differently abled persons b. Construction of night shelters	a.Utilization of funds earmarked under SJSRY / RYK b. Number of homeless as in census given homes in night shelters	a.% of earmarked funds utilized b. % homed in night shelters	2	**100%**				

Dr. SAMEER SHARMA
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
& COMMISSIONER, UPA